Approved For Release 2006/02/07: CIA-RDP91-00901 R000600290008-6 PBS MACNETL/ LEHRER NEWSHOUR

11 December 1984

STAT

MACNEIL: The question of how the United States should handle terrorism like this has become part of a public debate between the Pentagon and State departments over the appropriate use of military power. Today in London, Secretary of State Shultz continued his side of the argument. He said an attack of terrorists before they strike would be an act of self-defense worthy of public support. Shultz first raised the theme of pre-emptive self-defense in a speech last Sunday at New York's Yeshiva University. GEORGE SHULTZ (secretary of State): As a nation, we once again face the moral complexity of how we are to defend ourselves and achieve worthy ends in a world where evil finds safe haven and dangers abound. Today's events make this topic especially relevant, but in fact, it is an old issue. The Talmud addresses a fundamental issue that this nation has wrestled with ever since we became a great power with international responsibilities: how to judge when the use of our power is right and when it is wrong. The Talmud upholds the universal law of self-defense, saying, 'If one comes to kill you, make haste and kill him first.'

MACNEIL: For more on the theory behind Mr. Shultz's public statements, we talk with Lawrence Eagleburger, who retired from the number three job at the State Department last year. He's now president of Kissinger Associates, an international consulting firm based here in New York. Mr. Eagleburger, do you think the United States should attempt to retaliate for this hijacking? LAWRENCE EAGLEBURGER (former undersecretary of State): Oh, I think it probably would be a useful thing to do, and I don't mean in Iran. I suspect that our people know fairly well where these hijackers came from. So do (sic) the organization that they are a part of. And I wouldn't be at all upset if we were to try to strike back at that organization. But I think much more important than the question of whether we, we retaliate in this particular case is the general question it raises again of whether it isn't time the United States made a firm decision and announced it publicly that we will retaliate when we are struck.

MACNEIL: Let's take these things one at a time. In the present case, suppose U.S. intelligence does know that the

people who planned this hijacking live and are trained in a particular village in Lebanon, say, behind the Syrian lines, which might be plausible, ah, should the United States attack the way the Israelis do? EAGLEBURGER: Well, you see, it's, it's hard to answer the specific question. I would have to say if it is likely that there were going to be a lot of innocent people killed, because